

REMARKS

Claims 2-9 are pending in the application. A minor amendment has been made to Claim 2. This amendment is made such that Claim 2 is of equivalent scope as originally filed and, thus, is not a narrowing amendment. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection in view of the remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Nedd '602. This rejection is respectfully traversed. By way of the current amendment, Claim 1 has been cancelled, thereby rendering this rejection moot. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the present rejection is respectfully requested.

With regard to new independent Claim 9, Applicant submits that Nedd '602 fails to teach or suggest "a support frame having a upward flange; . . . a clamp being positionable in a clamping position operable to couple said support frame to the sidewall of the cargo box and an unclamping position disengaged from the sidewall of the cargo box, said clamp having a hooked flange hangable with said upward flange so as to support said clamp from said support frame when said clamp is in said unclamping position and permit removal of said clamp from said support frame by an upward lifting action." Accordingly, Applicant submits that Nedd fails to anticipate the claimed invention. Favorable consideration is respectfully requested.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

The Examiner states that Claims 2 and 3 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Accordingly, Applicant has amended Claim 2 to include the limitations of the base claim. Therefore, Claims 2 and 3 should now be in condition for allowance. Applicant thanks the Examiner for the favorable consideration of now-allowed Claims 4-8.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: Dec. 7, 2004

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

JLS/smb

By: Jeffrey L. Snyder
Stanley M. Erjavac, Reg. No. 38,442
Jeffrey L. Snyder, Reg. No. 43,141